

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RANDALL KEITH BEANE,
HEATHER ANN TUCCI-JARRAF,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:17-CR-82

PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE C. CLIFFORD SHIRLEY, JR.

October 18, 2017
9:35 a.m. to 11:24 a.m.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:

CYNTHIA F. DAVIDSON, ESQUIRE
ANNE-MARIE SVOLTO, ESQUIRE
Assistant United States Attorney
United States Department of Justice
Office of the United States Attorney
800 Market Street
Suite 211
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

FOR THE DEFENDANT:
RANDALL BEANE

RANDALL KEITH BEANE, PRO SE
Blount County Detention Center
920 East Lamar Alexander Parkway
Maryville, Tennessee 37904

FOR THE DEFENDANT:
(As Elbow Counsel)

STEPHEN G. McGRATH, ESQUIRE
9111 Cross Park Drive
Suite D-200
Knoxville, Tennessee 37923

REPORTED BY:

Rebekah M. Lockwood, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
(865) 210-6698
P.O. Box 1823

APPEARANCES (CONTINUED) :

FOR THE DEFENDANT:
HEATHER ANN
TUCCI-JARRAF

HEATHER ANN TUCCI JARRAF, PRO SE
105 Orchard Lane
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

FOR THE DEFENDANT:
(As Elbow Counsel)

FRANCIS LLOYD, ESQUIRE
9111 Cross Park Drive
Suite D-200
Knoxville, Tennessee 37923

Rebekah M. Lockwood, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
(865) 210-6698
P.O. Box 1823

1 (Call to Order of the Court)

2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: We are here for a scheduled
3 motion hearing in Case 3:17-CR-82, United States vs. Randall
4 Keith Beane and Heather Tucci-Jarraf.

5 Here on behalf of the government are Cynthia Davidson
6 and Anne-Marie Svolto.

7 Is the government present and ready to proceed?

8 MS. SVOLTO: Yes, Your Honor.

9 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Here on behalf of the
10 defendant as elbow counsel, on behalf of Defendant Beane, is
11 Stephen McGrath.

12 Is the defendant ready to proceed?

13 MR. BEANE: Yes.

14 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: And as elbow counsel on behalf
15 of Ms. Tucci-Jarraf is Francis Lloyd.

16 Is the defendant present and ready to proceed?

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Heather is ready to proceed, yes.

18 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Okay. Thank you.

19 THE COURT: All right. Before the Court today is the
20 filing of Ms. Tucci-Jarraf's praecipe to enter dismissal with
21 prejudice and Mr. Beane's motion to join in that filing. So
22 there's a number of other tangential motions or files that have
23 occurred since that time. We'll take those up separately.

24 Mr. Beane, is it correct that you want to join in
25 Ms. Tucci-Jarraf's praecipe filing?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MR. BEANE: Yes.

2 THE COURT: Do you know what a praecipe?

3 MR. BEANE: No.

4 THE COURT: Do you claim this Court has no
5 jurisdiction over you?

6 MR. BEANE: Yes.

7 THE COURT: Can you explain the legal basis for that
8 claim?

9 MR. BEANE: No.

10 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Tucci-Jarraf, how do you
11 pronounce your filing?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Praecipe.

13 THE COURT: Praecipe. Okay. And what do you
14 understand a praecipe to be?

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Praecipe is a command and it's an
16 order.

17 THE COURT: Okay. So if I understand right, you
18 contend that you can order this Court to do certain things?

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Based on the UCC filings that were
20 supplied to everybody in this room, that is actually a
21 perfected judgment, which was also supplied to -- at the time,
22 Department of Justice had a public integrity, Jack Smith,
23 who -- well, until last month --

24 THE COURT: I think you're doing what you do in your
25 filings, which is going on and on and not --

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm giving you the legal basis for
2 actually having the authority to deliver a praecipe.

3 THE COURT: I will ask you that probably in a minute.

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay.

5 THE COURT: That wasn't what I asked you.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Based on my authority --

7 THE COURT: No.

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- that is in the UCCs --

9 THE COURT: That wasn't what I asked you.

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That is why the praecipe -- I'm
11 not commanding any office in this room, but I am just stating,
12 based on the judgment that was provided to everyone, this is
13 the command of how to move forward.

14 THE COURT: A praecipe is an order to do certain
15 things.

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Correct.

17 THE COURT: Is it your position that you can order me
18 to do certain things?

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It is my position that I have the
20 authority to -- with the filings, this Court does not exist.
21 The positions of the United States of America, United States,
22 the alleged defendant -- or excuse me, the alleged plaintiff in
23 this Court does not exist, and all proof has been provided to
24 show it was foreclosed and terminated. And, therefore,
25 Anne-Marie Svolto -- and, I'm sorry, Cynthia's last name.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. DAVIDSON: Davidson.

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Davidson. Thank you,
3 Ms. Davidson.

4 They are here of -- in their own personal
5 responsibility. So there's been no proof to show that it
6 exists or the authority or authorization. So it's not that I'm
7 commanding anybody. If we're in an official capacity, it is
8 that their official capacities do not even exist.

9 THE COURT: So this is not a motion to dismiss your
10 indictment?

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It is not a motion. It's a
12 praecipe --

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- for dismissal with prejudice
15 based on the authority and UCCs, which are still unrebutted.

16 THE COURT: Did I understand at one time you were a
17 lawyer?

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I am a lawyer. I was at one time
19 an attorney, a licensed, barred attorney.

20 THE COURT: Okay. And during that time, didn't you
21 always as a lawyer file motions requesting orders, and the
22 court issued those orders?

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: As a barred, licensed --

24 THE COURT: That's a pretty simple answer.

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- attorney? No. As a barred,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 licensed attorney, when I worked for the government, there were
2 motions, there were pleadings, there was a lack of
3 understanding, basically, an incompetency, which were just --
4 it's in ignorance.

5 However, when I canceled my bar license and worked
6 with the judges and DOJ at the time, it was the praecipe
7 that -- you have to have standing to be able to do a praecipe.
8 So that's what we have here. My standing has -- and authority
9 has already been supplied to everybody in this room. And
10 that's what this praecipe is.

11 THE COURT: And when you say you have to have
12 standing to file a praecipe, what's the legal authority for
13 that statement? Where do you find something that says you have
14 to have standing to file a praecipe?

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, if I'm commanding someone,
16 it's the judgment that I provided you in the UCC. It's a
17 perfected, registered, and duly noticed, and secured judgment
18 that was done five years ago in 2012.

19 THE COURT: What's the judgment? What's it entitled?

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The judgment -- well, the
21 declaration of facts, is that the document that you're
22 referring to?

23 THE COURT: You prepared a declaration of facts, and
24 you consider that a legal judgment?

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. There was a declaration of

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 facts. In 2012, a foreclosure occurred, not just on the
2 corporation called the United States of America, but also on
3 every single corporation, private corporations, operating under
4 the guise of government. So all of those corporations were
5 actually closed and terminated. And that was with the
6 assistance and the help of those in the Department of Justice,
7 those in the federal and state courts here, as well as
8 internationally.

9 THE COURT: Do you have a document entitled
10 "Judgment"?

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The UCC, under the UCC, there is
12 no -- you don't need a courtroom for a judgment. In fact,
13 most --

14 THE COURT: I didn't ask about a courtroom. You kept
15 saying that you have a judgment.

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It's a perfected judgment. There
17 was no rebuttal of the declaration of facts. And DOJ, as well
18 as the U.S. Secretary of Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce,
19 Secretary of State, everybody was notified, as well as IMF,
20 IRS, Counsel of Privy -- Privy's Counsel, everybody involved,
21 World Bank, United Nations, you have Secret Service. Everybody
22 was involved in that foreclosure back in 2012 and 2013.

23 THE COURT: All right.

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: So when it went unrebutted, it's a
25 matter of law at that point. A declaration unrebutted stands

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 as law.

2 And it was entered into the Uniform Commercial Code,
3 which is a notification system, and that is actual due notice.

4 However, there were courtesy copies and courtesy
5 notices, personal service done around the world on top of that.

6 THE COURT: All right. I've read all that. And not
7 one of those things was what I asked you.

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You asked me about my authority.

9 THE COURT: I did not ask you that. You keep saying
10 that. I've never asked you that.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You asked me if I could command
12 you.

13 THE COURT: That was way back.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay.

15 THE COURT: If you will actually listen -- if you
16 want to go ahead and finish your speech, I'll listen to it.

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No, that's all right. Please --

18 THE COURT: But whenever you're ready to answer my
19 questions, if you'll just listen to them, most of them are yes
20 or no or very specifically focused.

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. Please repeat your
22 question.

23 THE COURT: Yes. You referenced a judgment
24 repeatedly.

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: What document is that judgment?

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That judgment was actually the
3 declaration of facts, which I provided to everyone. It is
4 Document 201 -- 2012127810.

5 Here, I'll read it from here so that it's quicker for
6 you.

7 THE COURT: I don't want you to read it. I just --

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. Just the judgment numbers.
9 You asked me what the judgment was. I'm giving you actual
10 numbers.

11 So, again, 2012127810, 2012127854, 2012127907, and
12 2012127914, along with the commercial bill, which is number
13 2012114586, and the true bill, which is 2012114776.

14 That is the actual complete judgment that is
15 commercially perfected in -- that was the one I'm referring to.

16 THE COURT: And what are those numbers?

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Those are Uniform Commercial
18 Code -- it's the UCC registration numbers from the actual
19 foreclosure that was done with all the parties therein named.

20 THE COURT: So is it the UCC financing statement that
21 you filed that you consider a judgment, or is it the
22 declaration of facts that you prepared that you consider a
23 judgment?

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. Actually, it goes all the way
25 back to the perpetuity, which would be the -- that was actually

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 done with members of the U.S. Treasury and the Federal Reserve.
2 That was UCC Doc No. 2000043135.

3 That was a perpetuity filing at that time, and it was
4 a UCC-1. That was done in May 4th, 2000 -- and that, these --
5 the documents that I told you about for the declaration of
6 facts lists every single document that were amendments to that
7 perpetuity done in 2000. That's never been rebutted to this
8 day. And it was perfected --

9 THE COURT: All right. I'm going to ask you one last
10 time, and then I will proceed, and I will note that you did not
11 answer the question. Okay?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I object to that. I have.

13 THE COURT: No, ma'am. You have not. I have asked
14 you, and you get a choice to answer this question or you can go
15 on with a whole bunch of numbers.

16 Is the judgment that you reference the UCC financing
17 statement filings, or is it the declaration of facts that
18 you've prepared?

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Which preparation? I've done a
20 number of declaration facts in this case, or are you talking
21 about the declaration of facts that the judgment actually was?

22 Please clarify that, only because there's a number of
23 declaration of facts.

24 THE COURT: No. You referenced a judgment. I tried
25 to get you to tell me what it was.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Sure.

2 THE COURT: And you haven't.

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. So the 2000 --

4 THE COURT: You have no document that says "Judgment"
5 on it. Is that correct?

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. The actual filings --

7 THE COURT: Is that yes or no?

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I do.

9 THE COURT: Let me see it. Hand me a document that
10 says "Judgment" on it.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It's dated November 28th. I'm
12 going to hand you my personal copy.

13 THE COURT: I'll be glad to hand it back.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: This is the actual judgment. Oh,
15 I'm sorry, here's two more pages. That's the actual judgment.

16 Just for the record, I've actually already
17 provided --

18 THE COURT: All right. The document you've handed me
19 is entitled in your handwriting at the top, "Declaration of
20 Facts." Is that correct?

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes. That's my own personal copy,
22 so that's my handwriting.

23 THE COURT: And then -- while you've handwritten on
24 all the stuff you've filed in here as well. Right?

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Possibly. But we're referring to

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 the actual judgment. The actual judgment doesn't have my
2 handwriting on it.

3 THE COURT: All right. It -- also, the actual form
4 is "UCC Financing Statement Amendment." Correct?

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: On that particular document, yes,
6 it's an amendment to the perpetuity.

7 THE COURT: Okay. And there is nothing in here --
8 there are copies of that, but there is nothing that says
9 "Judgment." Correct?

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. Inside of there, you will see
11 the word "judgment," however, because it goes unrebutted, it
12 stands -- the declaration unrebutted stands as law. So --

13 THE COURT: I understand your legal theory.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It is not a theory. It's a law
15 and maxim of law.

16 THE COURT: Okay. We'll go ahead and get to that.
17 If you'll hand this back, the Court will make note that there
18 is no judgment in the stack of papers that she gave me.

19 Now, on Page 2 of your filings, your praecipe, you do
20 list a group of maxims of law.

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Maxims of law?

22 THE COURT: Yes. Right?

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I was just -- I thought you said
24 "maximums."

25 THE COURT: Maxims of law.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes.

2 THE COURT: And what is your -- where is the legal
3 support for those maxims?

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Such as --

5 THE COURT: Like where do you get them?

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- being born from a fraud?

7 THE COURT: Where did you get them from?

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It's universal.

9 THE COURT: You just made them up?

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No.

11 THE COURT: Where did you get them?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: They're universally accepted.
13 Like, nothing can be born from a fraud.

14 That's something we've used when I was working as a
15 prosecutor for the government, nothing could be born from a
16 fraud.

17 THE COURT: Well, you said, "A declaration un rebutted
18 stands as law."

19 Where did you get that?

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: A declaration un rebutted, those
21 are in almost every court rule book.

22 THE COURT: I couldn't find it anywhere. Where would
23 you find it?

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm not sure about Tennessee. I
25 haven't gone --

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: Where would you find it anywhere? In
2 Washington?

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That declaration stands
4 un rebutted?

5 THE COURT: Yeah.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That would be in the court rules
7 typically of any state.

8 THE COURT: Okay. Do you know where?

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I do not know where in the --
10 Tennessee.

11 However, the rules, that's part of the thing is with
12 the declaration of facts, the actual judgment that was
13 perfected back in 2012, it was never rebutted.

14 There was foreclosure and a termination, which also
15 means all the policy statutes and codes belonging to that
16 particular entity also is unenforceable. They do not exist.

17 THE COURT: We're not talking about that. We're just
18 talking about maxims of law.

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Uh-huh.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Maxim of law is that which is
22 universally accepted and known to be true.

23 I don't know. Do you believe that something born of
24 a fraud exists?

25 THE COURT: I'm just asking where you got these. You

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 have submitted them, and I ask you --

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: They are -- they are universal
3 maxims that I have learned and been trained with in law school,
4 as well as in my time as an attorney working for the
5 government, as well as privately working as an attorney, and
6 then also as a lawyer after I canceled my bar license and no
7 longer was a licensed attorney or an attorney.

8 THE COURT: Okay. So what I'm hearing is, even
9 though it's universal, it's everywhere, you know all about it,
10 there's no place I could go and find these?

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm sure that we could spend some
12 time and look for them, if you would like. If you want a
13 specific reference, although I assumed everyone here, sitting
14 as an attorney or in this seat, is -- they're presumed to know
15 the law, so as far as the universal maxims, such as nothing can
16 be born from a fraud.

17 THE COURT: All right. Now, if I look over at
18 Page 4, and I -- right after those maxims in your praecipe,
19 it's your contention, first, that, among others, neither Chief
20 Judge Varlan nor I legally exist. Is that correct?

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Actually, I was waiting for proof
22 from you, as well as everyone that was listed inside of the
23 praecipe, and there were two praecipies, so I'm referring to the
24 one on the 29th.

25 THE COURT: Yes. That's the one I have in front of

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 me. It's on Page 4.

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. So we're not on the one
3 from yesterday?

4 THE COURT: No.

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay.

6 THE COURT: So is that correct, you claim that we do
7 not legally exist?

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: We actually -- from what I
9 understand and from the record, there was a declaration that --
10 of lack of jurisdiction of yourself of Guyton -- Mr. Guyton,
11 who was at the time in front of me, as well as Cynthia Davidson
12 and Anne-Marie Svolto.

13 THE COURT: Just --

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I have not received anything --

15 THE COURT: I did not ask --

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- from you guys.

17 THE COURT: -- about Ms. Davidson. I did not ask
18 about Ms. Svolto. I did not ask about Judge Guyton, did I?

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. To answer your question
20 very specifically and particularly --

21 THE COURT: Yes.

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- I have not received any
23 documented evidence, sworn, validated, and verified by you that
24 you exist, that you actually -- excuse me, you exist as far as
25 being a judge that supposedly works for Eastern Tennessee --

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 Eastern District of Tennessee, for the United States.

2 I haven't received any of that documentation from
3 you. The record is void of it.

4 THE COURT: And do you think I have to give that to
5 you?

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes, you do.

7 THE COURT: And where is the legal authority?

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: When I assert a declaration of
9 lack of jurisdiction and existence as a legal entity to come in
10 and have authority over me.

11 THE COURT: So if you were to claim I was a zebra, I
12 would have to issue proof that I wasn't?

13 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, that's just a -- I'm not
14 even sure whether the Court is going to be humorous, because
15 you're obviously not a zebra. I see that you are a human being
16 sitting there.

17 I'm saying, what is your authority? What is your
18 authorization? Because you have to be authorized.

19 THE COURT: Were you here at my investiture?

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No, but when was your investiture?

21 THE COURT: If you had been --

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: When was your investiture?

23 THE COURT: Back 16 years ago.

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. So whatever your
25 investiture was, it was inside of the United States

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 corporation. It was terminated. It was foreclosed upon.

2 THE COURT: Okay. So --

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: So that's why I'm asking for
4 everyone's authority, including yours and Judge -- you know,
5 Judge Varlan or the allegedness of that.

6 I don't know. I need to see your authority, your
7 identification, your authorization to actually do all this. I
8 do not have that.

9 THE COURT: I'm just trying to be sure I'm reading
10 this right is all.

11 Did you claim we do not legally exist as judges?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I do not have any sworn
13 documented, verification, or validation that you legally exist,
14 and have the authority to hold this court or to -- that this
15 court even exists, because I've actually delivered proof to all
16 of you, sworn, documented, verified, validated proof that they
17 do not exist.

18 You as a human being, yes, you do.

19 THE COURT: What I'm looking for is yeses and noes,
20 and then if you want to explain the yes or no, but you go
21 straight off into some bizarre explanation, and I never get an
22 answer.

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, I said I do not have any
24 documentation.

25 THE COURT: I didn't ask you if you have any

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 documentation.

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I don't have any documentation, so
3 therefore, no, you don't.

4 THE COURT: Okay. Your position is we don't legally
5 exist, because you have no documentation. And what
6 documentation would it take to convince you that I legally
7 exist?

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: A sworn -- with your signature and
9 seal, validation, and verification by you, sworn declaration
10 that the United States, first off, exists, that it's lawful,
11 that it's legal, that you actually have the authority, and then
12 I would need to see the authorization from the United States.

13 THE COURT: Then what would you do with all that?

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: If everyone had it, we would have
15 it. We don't. So 2012, 2013, all of this --

16 THE COURT: So, really, all that is --

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It would actually trump, wouldn't
18 it? It would trump that declaration of facts and judgment that
19 actually stands as a judgment as a matter of law under the
20 Uniform Commercial Code.

21 THE COURT: Well, first off, we can dispense with
22 that. Filing a UCC financing statement does not translate into
23 a judgment. Number one, that is contrary to the law.

24 Number two, a UCC financing statement doesn't even
25 have that potential.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 And, number three, you have absolutely no legal basis
2 for claiming it.

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Actually, I accept your statements
4 as proof of either, number one, your ignorance or --

5 THE COURT: That's fine.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- a collusion at this point.

7 THE COURT: Well, we'll get into that in just a
8 second.

9 If I understand, you also claim that we do not have
10 authority or jurisdiction of this criminal action. Is that
11 correct?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I have no documentation that
13 there's authority or jurisdiction over this action. So
14 therefore, no, I do not have proof of that.

15 THE COURT: I understand you don't have proof of
16 that.

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: If there is no proof of that, then
18 my position is actually validated and verified here in this
19 courtroom right now.

20 THE COURT: You claim that we do not have authority
21 or jurisdiction of this action, true or false?

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: True. I've declared that since
23 D.C. And I still have not been provided. If you had it, you'd
24 show it.

25 THE COURT: And you claim that you do not have -- we

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 do not have authority or jurisdiction over you or Mr. Beane?

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I have declared that you don't
3 have jurisdiction over me.

4 According to the record, Mr. Beane has declared you
5 don't have jurisdiction over him.

6 And the burden of proof shifts to you and to Anne
7 Svolto -- Anne-Marie Svolto and Cynthia Davidson.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You have not met your burden.

10 THE COURT: Is it your position that that is true
11 only as to you and Mr. Beane, or is that true as to everyone?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That particular judgment, which I
13 gave you, which according -- under the Uniform Commercial Code
14 and common law --

15 THE COURT: No. My question --

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It is absolutely a perfected
17 judgment, so that means everyone in this room is no longer a
18 citizen of a private corporation, nor are they an employee of a
19 private corporation --

20 THE COURT: Okay. Does --

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- operating under the guise of
22 government.

23 THE COURT: Does that mean that your position is that
24 not only do Judge Varlan and I not have any authority or
25 jurisdictions over you and Mr. Beane, but we don't have

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 authority over anyone?

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You know, can I just ask for a
3 clarification here? Because it feels like I'm giving legal
4 advice at this point.

5 THE COURT: I'm not asking for legal advice.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I've made a declaration that
7 nobody has authority or jurisdiction over me. At that point --

8 THE COURT: Right.

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- the burden shifts to those that
10 declare or that assert that they do.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I haven't received that. That's
13 what I'm saying.

14 THE COURT: Well, I'm asking you if your argument is
15 limited to you --

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I have no argument. I made a
17 declaration. There's a difference.

18 THE COURT: -- if -- your position is true only as to
19 you, or is it true as to everyone in the courtroom and outside
20 the courtroom?

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: My declaration, not position -- I
22 corrected it to declaration -- is everybody on this planet has
23 been taken out of the employment and the citizenship or the
24 ownership of private corporations operating under the guise of
25 government.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: Okay. So if I understand that right,
2 then anyone could commit a federal crime and we would not be
3 able to prosecute them. Correct?

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Again, these are -- all goes to
5 legal advice, which we -- you and I personally agreed I would
6 not go into.

7 THE COURT: I'm not asking you for your legal advice.
8 I'm asking you, is that part of your position, because I'm
9 trying to figure out how it works. So if it works as to you,
10 and if it works as to everyone --

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: This court is a bank. It's just a
12 bank teller. Okay?

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: This court operates as a banking
15 function.

16 THE COURT: That's my -- that's my point. If this
17 court is just a bank teller, if this court has no jurisdiction,
18 if this court doesn't exist, if this court has been foreclosed
19 on, if all those things are true, then there is no authority in
20 this court to sit in judgment of anybody who commits any
21 criminal offense. Correct?

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Every criminal offense that used
23 to be in the United States Code, which used -- I should say is
24 in the United States Code, which used to be enforceable --

25 THE COURT: Right.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- they are basically regulations
2 on commerce. Okay?

3 THE COURT: On what?

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: My hope -- on commerce.

5 THE COURT: Okay.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That's what Congress has the
7 unlimited power to do is regulate commerce.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: My entire last 20 years has been
10 spent to making sure that people such as yourself, Anne-Marie
11 Svolto, and Cynthia Davidson could actually do what we believed
12 we were doing.

13 When I was a prosecutor, I went in there because I
14 believed I was protecting the community. I was protecting that
15 until I ended up at the highest levels of banking trade and
16 finance before --

17 THE REPORTER: Can you please slow down?

18 THE COURT: I'm not interested -- yeah, let's just
19 cut her off. I'm not interested in your biography. I'm simply
20 asking how this -- I'm trying to see how this works.

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yeah. Not a problem.

22 THE COURT: Okay. So --

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It used to be one way, and now I'm
24 putting all my intent that it is another way.

25 THE COURT: In your world, in your idea of how this

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 works, because you think there is no U.S., and I think there
2 is, so in your -- in your declaration and your position, in
3 your theory and your whatever you want to call it, if someone
4 were to rob a bank, okay, could they be prosecuted in court by
5 a prosecutor like these young ladies or by a court like myself
6 or Judge Varlan?

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: If there is authority to do so,
8 then, of course.

9 THE COURT: Is there authority? I thought you said
10 there was no such authority.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You gave me a hypothetical.

12 THE COURT: Right.

13 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I gave you another hypothetical
14 answer -- or excuse me, the appropriate hypothetical answer
15 was, if there is authority and jurisdiction.

16 THE COURT: But in your position, there is no such in
17 this court.

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: This state of current events --

19 THE COURT: Right.

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- is that essentially all I did
21 was I closed and terminated the fraud. This court used to be
22 operating in a fraud. Okay. It still is until we go in and
23 actually clean things up.

24 It's not -- I get what everyone's intent and hearts
25 are set to, and I agree with you. That was the why things

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 could be taken down.

2 The only thing I took down was the corporate fraud
3 that was occurring called the United States. It was a
4 corporate fraud. That's it.

5 THE COURT: In the name of trying not to commit more
6 fraud, I take it your position then is, if someone robs a bank
7 today and they come in here, I should just tell them I have no
8 authority over them, I don't exist, and they should just go
9 home?

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm not going to give you any
11 legal advice of how you should conduct your affairs today.

12 THE COURT: I mean, that would be the ultimate result
13 of what you're proposing.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: At this point, because of where
15 you sit and where I get -- I get where you believe you sit, and
16 I get where everyone actually has that. Right now, this court
17 is not operating lawfully. You are not operating lawfully if
18 you don't have proof of your authority and jurisdiction. I'm
19 not consenting to you having authority and jurisdiction over
20 me. I'm not an employee of a defunct terminated corporation.
21 I'm not a citizen of a defunct corporation.

22 THE COURT: All right.

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: But I am here, you are here, and
24 we're all talking underneath -- in our own full responsibility.
25 This is what the restructure is about. This is what the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 statement is for, is all these funds go to the restructure.

2 THE COURT: I was hoping that at some point in our
3 discussion, you could see the fallacy in your argument or at
4 least your supporters could.

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, I hope that you see the
6 fallacy in your hypothetical.

7 THE COURT: But that is the long and short of your
8 proposition, that people could just go out today and commit any
9 kind of crimes, and there would be no way to prosecute them or
10 to bring them to justice, because by virtue of your foreclosure
11 in your own argument, by virtue of that, we have -- no longer
12 have any authority, we don't exist legally, and we could do
13 nothing with them.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Legally no. Nobody --

15 THE COURT: Okay. So that's my point.

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Nobody legally exists --

17 THE COURT: That's my point. We would have anarchy.

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- in that commercial structure
19 anymore, no.

20 THE COURT: The essence for this, if I understand it
21 is, that you contend that the United States was formerly
22 declared a corporation.

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Formerly? It's Anne-Marie Svolto
24 and Cynthia Davidson said that, and the alleged court clerk's
25 record it says the U.S.A. is the plaintiff. I'm just asking

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 for proof of the existence of the plaintiff.

2 THE COURT: I didn't ask about that. I'll just read
3 your own writing.

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It's not a corporation anymore.
5 It is -- it was cited in the United States Code. I gave you
6 that.

7 THE COURT: You said the United States was formerly
8 declared a corporation at 18 U.S. Code Section 3002(15).

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That was only the most recent
10 citing of --

11 THE COURT: That's the only thing you wrote.
12 Correct?

13 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Uh-huh.

14 THE COURT: You understand, don't you, that that cite
15 is just a definitional cite under the Federal Debt Collection
16 Procedure Act, don't you?

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I am very aware of the United
18 States being a corporation after working at the highest levels
19 of bank trade and finance, and that it is actually a
20 corporation that had been operating in fraud.

21 THE COURT: No, ma'am. It is not. And your only
22 reference to it does not even say that, does it?

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I would be happy, because this is
24 a bankrupt -- this was a bankrupt corporation. I actually went
25 in and cleaned up the bankruptcy and it was satisfied. So as

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 far as -- this is all banking.

2 THE COURT: You went in and cleaned --

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: This is all law.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You know, I am completely aware
6 that yourself and others are not aware of the actual current
7 law. I get that.

8 THE COURT: Well, in your mind, I appreciate that you
9 feel that way. What I'm asking you is, the legal cite that you
10 filed doesn't support what you claim. Correct?

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: How does it not support? It was a
12 corporation operating under the guise of government and it was
13 a bankrupt corporation.

14 THE COURT: It doesn't say that at 18 U.S.
15 Code Section 3002(15), does it?

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That was for -- that's for the
17 Fair Debt and Practices Act. Correct?

18 THE COURT: Yeah.

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That is part of the fraud that was
20 committed under the corporation operating under the guise of
21 the government. All we did was correct it. At this point, we
22 do move forward with a true government at this point. This
23 government that we all believe in, I believe in it too. I do
24 not believe in the --

25 THE COURT: Does it have judges?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- in a fraudulent --

2 THE COURT: Does your government have judges?

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: My government doesn't -- I --
4 right now, I do not have -- subscribe to any corporate
5 government, no.

6 THE COURT: All right. So just --

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: However, as far as we're not going
8 to be creating criminals, like we have been, to be able to feed
9 into the prison systems, which are all money based.

10 There are tons of undercover agents that I even met
11 with while I was in there who have been gathering evidence for
12 over the last five years, as well as marshals that were working
13 as marshals while I was there. This is all stuff that's going
14 to be coming out.

15 I completely respect you, Anne-Marie Svolto, and
16 Cynthia Davidson, Mr. Parker Still, Randy Beane, Steve, and
17 Francis, everyone that's in this courtroom, I respect you all.
18 I'm here because I spent the last 20 years working with those
19 inside the industries to clean this up.

20 I'm saying, yes, we can move forward. Yes, we can
21 have court. We can have different systems, but we are not
22 answering to a banking entity, into the banking families.
23 That's what I'm saying. It's slavery via monetary instruments.
24 And that's the fraud that was stopped.

25 THE COURT: And I guess the long and short of it is

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 simply just because you say it's so doesn't make it so.

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, and --

3 THE COURT: And that's true with everybody.

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Everyone, yes.

5 THE COURT: That's true with everybody.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: However --

7 THE COURT: In other words, if I were to issue a
8 declaration saying that, you know, you owed me some money, and
9 you didn't, quote, rebut it within the time I said it, doesn't
10 mean you owe it to me.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, if you gave me a notice that
12 I owed it to you, I would actually absolutely rebut it, because
13 if I don't owe it to you, I don't owe it to you.

14 THE COURT: But if you didn't, you still wouldn't owe
15 it to me --

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, if you gave me notice of
17 it --

18 THE COURT: So if I just made it up out of whole
19 cloth, and I just said, "You owe me a million dollars," and for
20 some reason you didn't rebut it, suddenly you owe me a million
21 dollars, even though --

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That would never happen.

23 THE COURT: -- there was no basis for the debt?

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That would never happen. I would
25 rebut it.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: But if you didn't?

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I wouldn't -- I would. I would
3 rebut it.

4 THE COURT: Suppose you just blew it off?

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I wouldn't. I would rebut it.

6 THE COURT: Or if anybody did. If I wrote it to
7 Ms. Svolto and she blew it off?

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm not responsible for
9 Ms. Svolto. She has to be responsible for her own things.

10 THE COURT: What I'm trying to show you is the
11 fallacy of that argument.

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The fallacy of the argument is
13 actually not telling anyone what their actual positions are
14 legally.

15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: As far as the legal status, their
17 legal identity, and everything else.

18 THE COURT: Well, I'm trying to do --

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: She's responsible for her own
20 debt. But if you sent it to me, I'm absolutely canceling it,
21 because it's not true.

22 THE COURT: Let's see.

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: May I ask for a clarification,
24 please?

25 THE COURT: I have no idea. I'm just trying to do my

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 job. And my job --

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That's what I'm asking.

3 THE COURT: -- which may not exist in your mind
4 anyway, but for everybody else in the world, my job is to rule
5 on motions that are filed in front of me.

6 And the way I -- and I understand every judge does
7 that, is to read the motion to see what the allegations are, to
8 see what the supporting law is, and to see what the other side
9 says in response to it, and then make a decision. That's what
10 we do. We do it day in and day out. Every judge in this
11 country has been doing it for hundreds of years.

12 And all I'm trying to do is go through that same
13 process with you by asking you what is the basis for these
14 various arguments. I've highlighted them. I've read
15 everything you filed. And I can't get you to stay with me on
16 that.

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, I have a clarification for
18 you --

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- which possibly might help here.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay.

23 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: There is a contrite ignorance,
25 from the moment that we go to law school, as far as what the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 law is, a true bill, for instance, can only be issued by the
2 original issuer.

3 So, for instance, there is an ignorance, not just
4 within this court, but within the whole entire legal industry,
5 everywhere that someone else can actually charge me or do a
6 true bill against me.

7 THE COURT: So no one --

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Or anybody.

9 THE COURT: Excuse me. Let me see if I understand
10 that, because I've never heard that law.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It's not a law. It's a matter of
12 fact as far as what paperwork goes from this courtroom through
13 the clerk's office.

14 THE COURT: No, no, no. You said no one can issue a
15 true bill against you except who, yourself?

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It's like someone trying to write
17 a check for me, signing my name, only they don't sign my name,
18 they try to get my signature in another way. That's what the
19 fingerprinting and the photo IDing is in the courthouse.

20 We actually at the highest level of banking trade and
21 finance, we actually have to have all that documentation. If
22 you send us a judgment, a conviction without having the
23 thumbprinting and the -- or the fingerprinting and the photo ID
24 along with the indictment, there is no charge. I'm talking
25 from a banking level.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 No matter what happens here today, and the only thing
2 I'm going to be able to do is to be able to accept all of your
3 statements as proof of ignorance. And I will state that with
4 all due respect, it is contrived, it is designed to have that
5 ignorance be present.

6 THE COURT: Okay. So --

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: However, at the banking level,
8 this is what this is about. Right now, every minute that we
9 discussed, because, mind you, with a praecipe, there is no --
10 it is not subject to discussion or merit. It is just entered,
11 and then later on, if they come back and they have proof --
12 because right now, the record is void, completely void of any
13 sworn documentation, validation, and verification that the
14 United States, the alleged plaintiff, exists. There is proof
15 that it doesn't exist, but there is no proof that it does
16 exist.

17 So unless you guys come forward with your proof of
18 authority, authorization, and jurisdiction, dated from
19 March 2013 onward, there is none.

20 THE COURT: Do you accept the United States
21 Constitution?

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The constitution used to exist.
23 It was actually canceled within the foreclosure. And that -- a
24 constitution is actually a contract. And, no, I've never been
25 a signatory to that contract.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 However, when I was a licensed, barred attorney,
2 before I was made aware of it, yes, I did swear to uphold the
3 constitution. However, it's a contract. I'm not a signatory
4 to it. Are you?

5 THE COURT: So if I -- I'm trying to figure out, you
6 keep saying you haven't given me any authorization. You
7 haven't given me any documentation. If my support for my
8 position was the United States Constitution and duly ratified
9 laws of the United States Congress, would that be sufficient?

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. It would have to come from
11 the Attorney General, who is Jeff Sessions at the moment.
12 Okay. He would have to validate and verify that the United
13 States Constitution is lawful.

14 THE COURT: And would you accept that if he did?
15 Would you accept then that the United States Constitution is
16 law?

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: If I had sworn verification and
18 validation.

19 THE COURT: Right.

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: With his signature and seal.

21 THE COURT: What's a seal?

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: His seal, it would be his
23 signature and then the biometric seal.

24 THE COURT: What's a biometric seal?

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: For every single --

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: What's a biometric --

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Biometric seal is a biometric
3 identification similar to the fingerprints.

4 THE COURT: So he has to put his fingerprint on
5 there?

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That's a biometric seal. It's the
7 same ones that the U.S. Marshals required, same ones you
8 required.

9 THE COURT: No, ma'am, I don't. Because what I'm
10 asking is, you know, for 16 years people have been going to
11 prison, I've been making rulings, I'm --

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I know.

13 THE COURT: -- doing a trial right now. My
14 fingerprint doesn't exist on any of those, neither does any
15 judges'. So in your mind --

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Actually, didn't you do
17 fingerprinting when you took your bar card?

18 THE COURT: I don't put them on my orders.

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No, but you did it for your bar
20 card. Right?

21 THE COURT: Well, somebody probably took my
22 fingerprints at some point. No, I don't think I ever did
23 anything for a bar.

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You didn't do any fingerprinting
25 whatsoever for background checks or anything like that in order

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 to take the bench?

2 THE COURT: I don't -- oh, to take the bench was
3 different, yeah.

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. So that is part of the
5 United States corporation when it legally existed and as it
6 functioned. Everyone is required to give their thumbprints. I
7 know for the FBI when I became a prosecutor for the United
8 States --

9 THE COURT: That's not my point. You said Jeff
10 Sessions would have to send something with his fingerprint on
11 it.

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yeah. I don't have Jeff
13 Sessions' -- his biometric seal. Either that or he could be
14 personally here and swear --

15 THE COURT: Do you understand there is nothing, other
16 than your claim, that says anybody has to file anything with
17 their fingerprint on it? You're the only person who claims
18 that.

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Actually, that's what --

20 THE COURT: And I realize we're all -- I understand
21 that we're all contrived ignorant, but there is nothing that
22 says that's the law, that that's required, or that any of that
23 has to be done, except you. You just write it repeatedly, and
24 then in your mind it becomes the law.

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. Actually, it is inside of

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 every single position that you take. When you do a background
2 check, you have to provide your fingerprints.

3 THE COURT: I didn't ask that. You said for him to
4 file something that has his fingerprint, his biometric seal
5 would have to be on it.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, then he can give me the one
7 that he supposedly gave to the United States corporation when
8 he took his position. But that is a seal.

9 And everyone here has required -- I don't know how
10 many times I was required, which I gave without prejudice and
11 under duress, my fingerprints, was to check me in to every
12 single hotel that the U.S. Marshals put me through on that
13 30-day tour. So I'm not asking for anything that isn't
14 actually asked for.

15 In fact, now, even in banking, you have to go in.
16 It's all a matter of banking. It's not a matter of law. It
17 never has been. It's all a matter of banking. But you do
18 actually fulfill those requirements. You just stated you did
19 when you took the bench.

20 THE COURT: Are you aware that the district courts,
21 like this one, have original jurisdiction over all criminal
22 offenses against the laws of the United States by statute?

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: When was that statute made and
24 entered?

25 THE COURT: I don't know. 18 U.S. Code Section 3231,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 I'm sure you're aware of that, having gone to law school.

2 Right?

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: When was that actually entered?
4 My point is, unless it's dated after March 13th -- excuse me,
5 March 18th, 2013, along with a newly issued constitution and
6 everything, I know they've already tried to reincorporate. All
7 of our people at BIS, they've tried to reincorporate the
8 corporation, but they could not.

9 THE COURT: So your position is that, even though
10 that's been the law of the land since the founding of the
11 country, if it hasn't been redone since you filed your
12 financing statement, it's no good, it's not good law, the
13 district courts do not have original jurisdiction over all the
14 criminal offenses against the United States?

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, the court never had original
16 jurisdiction -- or the United States is only a ten square mile,
17 if you've been to D.C. And then as far as branching it out,
18 that's where the fraud has occurred under the old statutes.
19 I'm saying that at this point, the federal corporation does not
20 exist. I have not received any sworn documentation rebutting
21 any of that to prove that it does exist.

22 And, you know, we're all having a conversation here,
23 but none of it actually counts, only because we still have not
24 received the authority, sworn declaration, sworn documentation,
25 verified and validated by you or Anne-Marie Svolto or Cynthia

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 Davidson stating your authority and jurisdiction, so therefore,
2 we're just having a conversation here.

3 I'm more than willing to accept this. And if you
4 accept documentation that you would like me to review and
5 decide whether to accept or reject --

6 THE COURT: But it has been --

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: But I don't have any.

8 THE COURT: It has been provided to you. That's the
9 point.

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: When was it provided, because I
11 have not received any? I don't know.

12 Has elbow counsel for Randy Beane received any?
13 Because maybe I'm just missing it.

14 THE COURT: Yeah, you did. It's cited in their
15 brief, and it's in the statute.

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Which none of those statutes, none
17 of those codes actually exist. They were part of the old
18 corporation offered under the guise of the government.

19 THE COURT: That's what I'm saying. It was provided
20 to you. Here it is. Here's the law that everybody in this
21 United States operates under. And it tells you that the
22 district courts of the United States shall have a original
23 jurisdiction, and you say that's just not right.

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. Because these belong to the
25 federal corporation, which was closed. And I do not have any

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 documentation that the federal corporation -- that there is
2 another federal corporation, because the other one was
3 terminated and foreclosed.

4 So unless you show me where the United States
5 actually exists with the legal documentation of a legal entity,
6 these codes mean nothing. In fact, they're only just proof of
7 collusion at this point.

8 THE COURT: Okay.

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: We have proof of collusion. And
10 at the same time for me, while -- thank you, very much. It may
11 be proof of collusion, I believe it's a matter of -- and I say
12 this with all due respect, you guys, because I was in the same
13 spot till I worked with DOJ -- with those in DOJ, and the FBI,
14 U.S. Marshals, World Bank, Federal Reserve, and everybody else,
15 this is a banking structure. It's a corporate structure for a
16 reason.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Or it was. That was what was
19 terminated and closed. I am -- have you -- are you in receipt
20 of the Declaration of Statement of Assessments? That's
21 Document 55.

22 THE COURT: Is that the one where you claim some
23 people in this court system, maybe me included, owe you \$46
24 quintillion?

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Oh, I see where the -- no, this is

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 not you directly.

2 THE COURT: Oh, good.

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Or to anyone here.

4 THE COURT: Good.

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: This is the amount that is
6 running, and actually since 901, it's been doubled and
7 compounded.

8 THE COURT: So, like, we're up to 92 quintillion? I
9 probably don't have that.

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, this has to do with the
11 Federal Reserve and Bank for International --

12 THE COURT: They probably don't have that.

13 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: They don't. They're trying to
14 create it like mad. That's what September 15th was about.

15 THE COURT: Well, let's move on a second.

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: As long as you are noticed that
17 this is existing, you've received it. Has Anne-Marie --

18 THE COURT: I'd just tell you to be careful -- I'd
19 just tell you to be careful about some of your filings, and
20 Mr. Lloyd can advise you of that, that, you know, there's other
21 statutes that obviously you will not agree exist, but,
22 unfortunately, the rest of the country and this court and the
23 prosecution -- prosecutors and the marshals and ultimately the
24 Bureau of Prisons will deem exist, that make it a crime to file
25 certain things against judges --

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Oh --

2 THE COURT: -- false filings. So just -- all I'm
3 saying is just be careful.

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, I just want to make a
5 clarification for everyone's peace of mind but also for the
6 record. These are not liens against anybody in this
7 courthouse, in this room at all, or in your personal positions
8 at all. These are actually going towards the entities that are
9 committing the fraud that have not gone into actually
10 explaining any of this to you, but literally that you are --

11 THE COURT: All right. So if I understand -- I'm
12 trying to put all this together and figure it out.

13 One of the problems I have is, you're claiming that
14 none of these laws really exist, authority doesn't exist in
15 either the courts or the statutes, but the whole basis for your
16 claim is based on the legal authority of the UCC?

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: My legal authority is I'm here,
18 I'm existing. I'm proving and have proved and giving you
19 documentation that I exist.

20 THE COURT: The claim that you foreclosed on the
21 United States.

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, that's aside from this
23 moment. Right now I gave you actual documentation. The record
24 is void of any kind of documentation provided by any of you
25 stating your identification, your authority, your authorization

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 to actually present to the United States.

2 THE COURT: We've heard that. We've heard that
3 repeatedly. You don't have to say it again. It's in the
4 record. Okay? I'll give it to you.

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, I do have to say it. Can I
6 have it? Do you have it for me?

7 THE COURT: It's -- my -- it's my question that's on
8 the table. Is the genesis of your basis that the UCC exists?

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No, the UCC was closed.

10 THE COURT: UCC was closed.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It was terminated on March 18th,
12 2013 when the DOJ, Secretary of State, U.S. Treasury, and other
13 international equivalents --

14 THE COURT: So you're --

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- could not rebut. Everything
16 was accepted, duly accepted, and that is the other filings that
17 were included in the declaration of facts. It was all
18 terminated, including the United States Code, including the
19 United States of America as a corporation operating under the
20 guise of government.

21 THE COURT: All right.

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That's the one that was closed,
23 just so you know.

24 THE COURT: So the UCC filing that you made, do I
25 understand that you think that that foreclosed on things like

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 the Federal Reserve bank and the United States. Is that right?

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I know it removed them as
3 custodians. They were left as facilitators so that everything
4 could be repurposed. However, we had a number of people going
5 in and doing their own agendas at that point and created a
6 vacuum, so --

7 THE COURT: But you've said they were foreclosed on.

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: They were all duly, legally, and
9 lawfully foreclosed upon using the same exact procedures that
10 are used all over the United States.

11 THE COURT: Okay. And so who owns the Federal
12 Reserve bank now?

13 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The Federal Reserve bank has been
14 inside of BIS the entire time.

15 THE COURT: Inside what?

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The bank, Federal Reserve Bank?

17 THE COURT: Yeah. Did you say DIS?

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It's called Bank for International
19 Settlements.

20 THE COURT: BIS.

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yeah. BIS.

22 THE COURT: And where is the Bank for International
23 Settlements?

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Excuse me?

25 THE COURT: Where is the Bank for International

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 Settlements? Who is that?

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Bank for International Settlements
3 is the central bank of all the central banks, or it was.

4 THE COURT: Where is that?

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That's in Switzerland.

6 THE COURT: So Switzerland owns --

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No.

8 THE COURT: Okay. Who owns the Federal Reserve Bank
9 and the FDIC and all the other banks?

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, the FDIC is closed. It's
11 only open -- all these corporations only exist as a matter of
12 bookkeeping only.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Ledgering.

15 THE COURT: So who owns the Federal Reserve Bank?

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The Federal Reserve Bank?

17 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Everyone on the planet owns it
19 equally.

20 THE COURT: Okay. And so --

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Pursuant to those filings.

22 THE COURT: And I understand that your filings said
23 that each person was entitled to \$6 billion as a result of that
24 filing. Is that right?

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No, it's not.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: It's not?

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No, it's stated incorrectly.

3 THE COURT: Oh.

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Everyone -- everyone's state of
5 body, which would be their actual -- their bodies, and those
6 are under the ownership and care of each individual.

7 As far as the 5 billion -- according to the
8 commercial bill and the true bill, there is 5 billion in pre --

9 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry? Pre-19?

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Sorry. Pre-1933 gold and silver,
11 which is the lawful money or was the lawful money of the United
12 States, and that's what was duly secured, registered, and
13 noticed.

14 THE COURT: So what I'm --

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: So it's actually 10 billion for
16 every prejudice since March 13th, 2013 -- excuse me,
17 March 18th, 2013, every prejudice done towards you, towards
18 anyone, and that includes having you sit on a bench, serving a
19 private interest other than doing the job that you truly have
20 believed that you've been doing this entire time, it's
21 10 billion ledgered each time, which is why the economies are
22 in the state they are. It's actually ledgered through BIS.

23 THE COURT: Okay. So every -- every one of us in
24 this courtroom is entitled to \$10 billion?

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm not sure what your accounts

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 are at this time. Like I gave you --

2 THE COURT: At least.

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I gave you an example of what just
4 this case -- these alleged cases alone --

5 THE COURT: I'm looking at your filing. I'm looking
6 at your filing back in 2012.

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yeah. That was notice and
8 security for every single being on this planet --

9 THE COURT: Right. Have you --

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- that when there's a
11 prejudice --

12 THE COURT: Have you gone and gotten yours, your
13 5 billion?

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Everything is ledgered over to
15 BIS. So, yes -- and I was actually given the -- I was, until I
16 was threatened and said that I could only use mine and a small
17 group of my friends, but they didn't want the word out to
18 anybody else, because too many people were --

19 THE COURT: So you've gotten yours, but nobody else
20 can get --

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. I rejected everything.

22 THE COURT: We don't --

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I rejected everything. If
24 everyone is to have access to their accounts, you have
25 accounts --

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: That was magnanimous of you to give up
2 your 5 billion because everybody else couldn't get it, huh?

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I have much more. These are
4 ledgered accounts.

5 And I know that you are making fun of things right
6 now, but I'm being very, very serious right now. And I spent
7 20 years of my life to make sure the fraud and slavery stopped.

8 THE COURT: I was interested to see if there was
9 anything to your argument. And that's why I asked you the 40
10 questions before this --

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I don't have argument --

12 THE COURT: -- because once you --

13 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- I have declaration.

14 THE COURT: Once you have no concept of the law in my
15 mind, then all this other stuff has no moment and no merit. I
16 wanted to see if you would agree with the basic principles of
17 law and the statute and the constitution. And if you did, then
18 I would have to say, "Wow, maybe I ought to look at this." But
19 once I heard you say that -- you know, all the things you said,
20 then it pretty well confirmed to me, and here's why. Let me --

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm sorry. I didn't understand
22 that last piece. Could you please repeat it?

23 THE COURT: No. Did you -- let me ask you this.
24 Maybe this will help you. Did you study the UCC in law school?

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes, I did.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: And you are aware, then, that the UCC is
2 not a law?

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The UCC, as I stated earlier, the
4 United States Commercial Code.

5 THE COURT: Right.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Is just a regulation of uniform
7 registration system, a notification system. That's what it is.

8 THE COURT: My point is, it doesn't exist. You
9 understand that.

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: United States Commercial Code does
11 not exist?

12 THE COURT: It's not called the United States
13 Commercial Code, is it?

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The UCC that you're referring to,
15 the notification system --

16 THE COURT: Uh-huh. Right.

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- or the actual regulations?
18 Which one are you speaking of?

19 THE COURT: I'm talking about the UCC that you have
20 referenced throughout every document that you have filed. You
21 are aware that that is not a law. That is a group of people
22 who got together and put together a proposed set of uniform
23 laws that the various states of the United States might choose
24 to adopt so that we might have some uniformity between the
25 states.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 And each state, like Tennessee, adopts its own
2 version of the UCC, and changes whatever terms it wants to, so
3 that each state has its own version of the UCC, but there is no
4 law, per se, called the UCC.

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm aware of that.

6 THE COURT: Okay. So.

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: UCC is a notification system or
8 was a notification system.

9 THE COURT: No. Each state has a version of the UCC
10 with a notification system. Correct?

11 There is no UCC notification system, is there?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Then what are the actual filings
13 that they are doing? That is them filing whatever property or
14 claims that they believe that they have or positions that they
15 have.

16 It is a -- it was a notification system, and each
17 state -- I agree with you, each state had its own versions that
18 they've adopted and that they used.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That is absolutely correct as
21 to --

22 THE COURT: So what you just referenced, the UCC and
23 a number, like UCC 301, there is no such thing. There's a
24 proposal for a Section 301, but there's no law. There's no UCC
25 301, is there?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: There's going to be a lot of
2 bankers, and even your court clerk is going to be very upset to
3 hear that. Because everything that you guys do is entered into
4 the -- or was entered into the UCC --

5 THE COURT: Nothing I do -- no, ma'am. Nothing I do
6 is entered into the UCC. Nothing. Because it doesn't exist.
7 If you would cite me --

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I agree with you that it --

9 THE COURT: -- to a statute where it exists, I will
10 look it up, and we will show everybody.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Is that a United States Code?

12 THE COURT: Yeah. Well this has the code at the
13 back, yeah. Where is it? It's not in there. It was put
14 together by a group of private groups, like the American Law
15 Institute. You know that. You learned that in law school.

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I did. I've had to work with --

17 THE COURT: You just made this stuff up. There is no
18 UCC 301.

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. I didn't make it up.

20 THE COURT: There's no UCC 103, is there?

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I did not make anything up. These
22 are actually common law -- common law principles.

23 THE COURT: So here we have --

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The UCC is utilized by every
25 single system and function from the U.S. corporation when it

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 was in a function of a corporation. Now there is no
2 corporation. What I'm saying is, everything goes forward
3 exactly as we all designed.

4 THE COURT: So here we have the Tennessee version.

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Of what? I'm sorry, I can't see
6 that far.

7 THE COURT: Of the commercial transactions. And
8 there's a 47-3-301, because that's how Tennessee chose to
9 codify --

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Everyone -- which is why in the
11 filings what we've -- I handed forward, the actual declaration
12 of facts, which came up to judgment due to nonrebuttal, it
13 actually states that all national and international
14 equivalents --

15 THE COURT: Your whole basis --

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: All state and international
17 equivalent. So it's whatever equivalent Tennessee would have
18 to that particular recording, they've all been honored there.

19 THE COURT: My point is, you understand they're all
20 different.

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That's why the filings are written
22 the way they are, United States federal government, United
23 States state of, and any and all international and universal
24 equivalents, it's the same thing.

25 THE COURT: And the whole basis, like I'm looking at

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 your financing statement --

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: So your Tennessee Code you just
3 referenced there had been included because of the actual
4 language.

5 THE COURT: Okay.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: And, again, I -- at this point, as
7 far as I still have not received, while we've been sitting here
8 for however long, these amounts that are being ledgered,
9 everyone's had notice of them.

10 THE COURT: All right.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: All of that. What I'm asking from
12 you is, do you have for me, because I'd be more than willing to
13 accept it at this point, so I'm going to ask for the final
14 time, because it's already been asked in writing quite a few
15 times, do you, C. Clifford Shirley, and Anne-Marie Svolto, and
16 Cynthia Davidson, and Parker Still, because he was included in
17 that as well, as well as the alleged court clerk and her
18 deputies, do you have for me today, any sworn documentation
19 validating and verifying your authority, your identification,
20 your authorization from the actual United States --

21 THE COURT: Number one --

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- for me to go forward and prove
23 in validation, verification that the laws that you are
24 claiming, that myself and Mr. Beane have violated are actually
25 lawful? Do you have that for me from Jeff Sessions?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: I do not have that for you from Jeff
2 Sessions.

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Thank you.

4 THE COURT: Number one. Number two, you are not
5 entitled to that.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Under what basis?

7 THE COURT: Number three, even if I produced it, you
8 wouldn't accept it. You've just said it.

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I did not.

10 THE COURT: Yes, you did.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I said that I --

12 THE COURT: When I said --

13 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I started out that way, I'm more
14 than willing to accept anything that you have for me to
15 review --

16 THE COURT: All right.

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- for acceptance and rejection.
18 So you're telling me you don't have it --

19 THE REPORTER: Excuse me, excuse me.

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes?

21 THE REPORTER: For acceptance of what?

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Sorry. For acceptance to review.
23 I would accept it to review for acceptance of rejection -- I
24 don't know what's going to be handed to me.

25 THE COURT: All right.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: But I'm more than willing to
2 receive, to accept whatever you're going to hand me for further
3 review, for acceptance, eventual acceptance or rejection,
4 depending on what you give me.

5 THE COURT: I have determined that based on what
6 you've said, that my official and formal appointment from the
7 United States government would not be acceptable to you because
8 you've said it doesn't exist, I don't exist.

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: If you want to hand it to me
10 and --

11 THE COURT: No.

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- with your signature and
13 everything, I will definitely look at it.

14 THE COURT: No. I don't have to do that.

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I've asked you for that.

16 THE COURT: I understand that.

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You have not provided it to me
18 ever. So I'm asking you for it. And now are you refusing to
19 give it to me?

20 THE COURT: I don't have it for you, nor do I have
21 any signature from Jeff Sessions, nor his fingerprints, nor his
22 biometric seal.

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You asked me earlier, so now
24 you're --

25 THE COURT: I do not have it.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- you're making fun of me. I am
2 just saying at this point, I do not have anything from you. I
3 would be more than willing to look at -- I've never seen your
4 appointments. I don't know what Tennessee's looks like. If
5 you want to hand that to me, that would be great. Anne-Marie
6 Svolto and Cynthia Davidson --

7 THE REPORTER: I need you to slow down. I cannot
8 type that fast.

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I apologize.

10 THE COURT: When the record -- listen, when the
11 record isn't accurate, in your mind, it will be because you
12 were repeatedly advised to slow down and you wouldn't. I just
13 want that on the record.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm not trying to intentionally
15 upset you or to even speak fast, it is just a natural flow for
16 me. So I will consciously make sure that I maintain a pace
17 that you can record. So my apologies for any inconvenience.

18 THE COURT: Now, you filed copies of the indictment
19 and copies of the government's response to those, and you
20 marked all over those that they were basically void. Is that
21 right? And that you --

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Which document are you referring
23 to? Are you speaking to me or to Mr. Beane?

24 THE COURT: To you. Let's see. What are those
25 documents, 48 and, I think, 49 and 53? Do you recognize that?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 You came and filed those the other day. If you'll look up
2 here.

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I've got 48, Document 48.

4 THE COURT: And you just said that the indictment is
5 duly canceled and void. Is that right?

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. I have Document 50, which
7 was -- that was your --

8 THE COURT: I'm asking you about Document 48, the
9 indictment in this case.

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes. I have Document 48 and
11 Document 58 in front of me.

12 THE COURT: Okay. And you just marked across them,
13 the indictment, void and duly canceled.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes, I took a certified copy out
15 from the clerks, because they have the original, so I took it
16 out. They would not give me a redacted -- or excuse me, the
17 unredacted.

18 THE COURT: And is it your position that because you
19 marked on that and put your fingerprint on it, that that makes
20 the indictment void?

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes. It is my understanding from
22 charging -- my history of charging, charging documents, as well
23 as in the highest levels of bank trade and finance where we
24 receive the actual documentations for monetization -- for the
25 monetization, which this is the only way. Only the true

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 original issuer can actually cancel something. Same as if I
2 write a check. I'm the only one that can actually cancel it.
3 So when I was taken on the 25th --

4 THE COURT: Who's the original issuer of the
5 indictment?

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I am the original issuer of the
7 indictment.

8 THE COURT: You issued this indictment against
9 yourself?

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: This indictment through collusion
11 at the highest levels that actually give you all the rules that
12 you think you're following, or that you have followed, excuse
13 me, that you think are lawful, that is actually how charging
14 documents work, and they are monetized. These are prepared for
15 monetization.

16 So only with the fingerprints and the signature of
17 the actual person that is being indicted, they are the original
18 issuer of that indictment, so nobody goes to jail, nobody goes
19 and gets charged with a crime except by their own consent.

20 This is a voiding of any consent, whether presumed or
21 actual. It's what we call manufactured consent, because
22 informed, knowing, willing, and intentional, that is consent.

23 THE COURT: Okay.

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: However, the way this document and
25 the way that they conducted themselves is not consent. It's

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 manufactured consent by presumption and threat of force, threat
2 of use of force.

3 So this is just canceling the indictment, which I'm
4 the only one that issued it against myself. So that's why I'm
5 saying, if they want to bring forward the foreman, or if she
6 wants to -- Cynthia Davidson wants to show me her authority,
7 and authorization, and identification to be able to actually
8 issue a charge against me, that's what I'm asking for. I still
9 haven't received it.

10 As of this moment, this record is void of any of
11 those documentations, which were required in order to rebut the
12 declaration that you don't have jurisdiction. Nobody has
13 jurisdiction or authority over me.

14 THE COURT: Okay. You also filed a praecipe,
15 Document 54, just recently, which appears to be an order for
16 dismissal, signed -- signed by you. Is that correct?

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I provided the blank one to
18 everybody that's in this room or parties to this particular
19 case. And then behind that, I did sign one. It would be
20 Page 6 is the one I signed. However, the -- the blank one --
21 so it's proposed -- I signed for my part, because I'm the only
22 one that can give authorization --

23 THE COURT: So if the style of the case is the
24 alleged United States District Court, and the order for
25 dismissal with prejudice is signed by Heather Ann Tucci-Jarraf,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 your proposal is that you have authority to issue orders in
2 this court?

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, if you actually read this,
4 it's giving you leave to actually file this, to actually --

5 THE COURT: I understand filing it. But I'm asking
6 you, the authority to sign an order you believe rests in you?

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Actually, the authority is stated
8 in here. And this is -- still, I have not received anything as
9 far as your jurisdiction. If there is no jurisdiction
10 established and the burden is on you and it is on Anne-Marie
11 Svolto and Cynthia Davidson, I do not -- there is no authority
12 whatsoever here, so therefore, it's -- the case is dismissed.

13 THE COURT: Did you have authority to sign that
14 order?

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I did.

16 THE COURT: And did --

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: And it actually has to be signed
18 by you in order to go forward.

19 THE COURT: Why? It just says all I'm doing is
20 granting you leave to file it.

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well --

22 THE COURT: Not to enter it.

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Exactly. Because I don't have
24 anything from you, any sworn, verified, and validated proof,
25 documentation that you actually have authority over me. And

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 I'm not consenting to you having authority over me. I'm here
2 so that we could resolve this in a very amicable manner.

3 THE COURT: All I'm trying to do is ask you
4 questions. If I could get an answer, it would be so much
5 simpler.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Right now I'm the only one,
7 myself, and I've seen the declarations or the documentation
8 provided by Mr. Beane. Right now we're the only two in this
9 courtroom. He has authority only over himself, I only have
10 authority over myself.

11 MR. BEANE: If I may ask a question?

12 THE COURT: Yes.

13 MR. BEANE: You referenced on August 29th, in
14 reference back on August 29th, you specifically asked me if I
15 thought I was God in the courtroom.

16 THE COURT: Right. Because you said you were the
17 source of all that is.

18 MR. BEANE: My question to you is, what gives you
19 authority over me in this situation if you aren't God?

20 THE COURT: Is it your position that a judge does not
21 have authority over you when you are alleged to have committed
22 a crime?

23 MR. BEANE: We've asked for that proof of who you
24 are.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MR. BEANE: That's all we're asking for.

2 THE COURT: All right. And so if I showed you my
3 appointment as a United States magistrate judge, would that
4 suffice for you?

5 MR. BEANE: It would be for my review and also
6 Ms. Tucci-Jarraf's.

7 THE COURT: Well, would that suffice? Because that's
8 what I have.

9 MR. BEANE: Well, we would review it and then our
10 answer would be --

11 THE COURT: Would that suffice for you?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, I would also need the --

13 THE COURT: If I saw your diploma --

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Only -- it would only be one part
15 of documentation that's required amongst the rest. I would
16 need proof --

17 THE COURT: What's the rest?

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I would need proof that the United
19 States actually exists and is lawful and validated. The only
20 one that can actually do that is --

21 THE COURT: I can't prove that, can I? Because they
22 don't under your theory. As of March 13th, 2013, they don't
23 exist. So how could I prove that?

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: If you -- are you claiming that
25 you work for the United States?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: Yes, I work for the United States courts.

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. Wouldn't the United States
3 courts, the United States itself, wouldn't that documentation
4 be available to you? I mean, it's the same as working for an
5 employer. Wouldn't they have their articles of incorporation?
6 Wouldn't they have their board resolution giving you authority?
7 That's the stuff that I'm looking for.

8 THE COURT: I do. And I've told you it's in the
9 United States Constitution which gives the -- Congress the
10 authority to set up the courts. I gave you the statute in
11 which Congress took that authority and set up the courts. It
12 specifically sets up this court, and it allows for judges, like
13 myself, and so that's our authority.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. So then all you would need
15 is a declaration from --

16 THE COURT: I don't need to give a declaration.
17 That's the law.

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. What I'm saying is, is from
19 Jeff Sessions, who is the one that actually set up these
20 courts, and DOJ, everyone's underneath him. Correct? He would
21 just have to validate and verify your appointment.

22 THE COURT: He doesn't set up this court. He doesn't
23 give me my authority.

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. Whoever gives you your
25 authority, that's who we would need. And then we need

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 identification of that and their authority.

2 THE COURT: Okay.

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It's just a -- it's called an
4 evidentiary paper trail, which I know you're very familiar
5 with, as well as they are. We're just saying what's your
6 identification and your authority and your authorization?
7 Whoever gave you the authorization, the same things are
8 required. What is their identification? What is their
9 authority? That's what is needed, a paper trail all the way
10 back to the beginning, otherwise there is no authorization.

11 You would actually -- at that point, everything that
12 has been stated here today without that is just proof of, one,
13 collusion or incompetency.

14 And I don't believe you're an competent gentleman at
15 all. I don't believe Anne-Marie Svolto and Cynthia Davidson
16 are incompetent. I just believe that there has been a lot
17 withheld as far as information and data, and it is all
18 fraudulent.

19 That's what was shut down was just the fraud that was
20 being committed by the banking parts of the systems, which I
21 was completely involved with.

22 So as far as coming in here, this is out of courtesy,
23 because there is none of that documentation that I requested,
24 and you stated you didn't have, and you've indicated that you
25 will not give it to me, period.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 Anne-Marie Svolto and Cynthia Davidson, as well as
2 Parker Still, and everyone else that's been named in there have
3 remained silent.

4 THE COURT: Let me just be sure, because now, after
5 today's hearing, you may be treading on questionable ground.

6 Do you recognize my authority to issue the release
7 order that I released you on or not?

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: For me, that was a private
9 agreement between you and I.

10 THE COURT: No, ma'am. That was a court order issued
11 by me as the magistrate judge. You either accept that
12 authority or you do not. And if you do not --

13 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I accept it.

14 THE COURT: -- why would I allow you to remain out?

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I accepted the agreement, and I
16 still accept --

17 THE COURT: No, it's not an agreement. It's an order
18 from me with all the authority of the United States behind it.
19 Do you accept that or do you not? It's a yes or a no.

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I accepted the order that you did
21 without prejudice, which means all the stuff that isn't there,
22 isn't there. But I am following this order that you and I
23 entered into.

24 THE COURT: You understand you have to comply with
25 the conditions in my court order?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Have you received any information
2 otherwise that I have not followed everything that you and I
3 signed off on?

4 THE COURT: I didn't ask you about whether you
5 followed them. I asked you did you agree that you must follow
6 them?

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I agreed to see you on that day,
8 and I reconfirm it again this day, that I agree to it, I'm
9 following it.

10 THE COURT: You understand you have to comply with my
11 court order or you don't get to stay out. Correct?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I told you then and I told you
13 now, I choose to follow that court order because we're going to
14 finish this all amicably, I said until this was disposed of in
15 an amicable way and affinitive way, that I would follow that
16 agreement between you and I -- or that order that was signed
17 off by both of us.

18 THE COURT: Do you agree that I have the authority to
19 issue that order?

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I agree that I gave you consent to
21 issue that order, yes.

22 THE COURT: All right. Give you one last chance.

23 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Without jurisdiction.

24 THE COURT: I'll give you one last chance. Do you
25 agree that I have the authority to issue that order?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You have the authority to issue
2 that order because I gave you that authority to issue that
3 order.

4 THE COURT: Okay.

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It is an order I continue to
6 follow until we have a disposition in this case, a final
7 disposition.

8 THE COURT: All right. Do you have anything further
9 to argue with regard to your non-motion? Because you've said
10 it's not a motion. I mean, I'm not being facetious.

11 You specifically made a filing that said your
12 praecipe is not a motion. Correct?

13 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: A praecipe.

14 THE COURT: Right.

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: First off, I'm not arguing
16 anything. I have declared.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I have made declarations. They've
19 not been rebutted.

20 THE COURT: All right. It's a declaration, not a
21 motion. You're not asking me to do anything.

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. The praecipe is an order, but
23 the basis for those orders being issued were the declaration of
24 due cause.

25 THE COURT: Okay. But it's not a motion in which you

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 have moved the Court to do anything?

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The addressees on that praecipe
3 were ordered to do the praecipe one.

4 THE COURT: Okay. They'll either do them or they
5 won't. I mean, when you order somebody to do something, they
6 either do it or they don't. So they'll either do it or they
7 won't.

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That's correct. They will do it
9 or they don't. There was a notice that was put in there.

10 THE COURT: Okay.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: But the basis for doing those or
12 not was given to everyone, which is the --

13 THE COURT: I got you.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- declaration of due cause.

15 THE COURT: I got that.

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That is the authority that was --
17 that it's based on.

18 THE COURT: I'm just trying to figure out if I have
19 to do anything. Because when people file a motion, I have to
20 file an order responding to that motion. In this case, there
21 is no motion --

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, I would have filed a motion,
23 but the Court, you yourself, Anne-Marie Svolto, and Cynthia
24 Davidson have not provided proof of jurisdiction or authority,
25 so therefore, I couldn't file any motions.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: Okay.

2 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: And I don't consent, I haven't
3 consented to any authority, other than what you and I just
4 clarified --

5 THE COURT: Well, that would be --

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- in that particular order of
7 detention.

8 THE COURT: That would be an incorrect statement,
9 because I ordered you to have a deadline for today for filing
10 motions. You chose not to file a motion. You could have filed
11 a motion.

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No.

13 THE COURT: No. Everybody does in these cases.
14 The -- all the defendants file motions. Well, not all, but
15 most defendants file motions, and then I rule on them. You
16 chose not to. Instead, you chose to file a praecipe. And you
17 say you can't because you haven't gotten this information from
18 us, but that's just the basis for your choice not to file one.

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: So is it your position that if you
20 don't have jurisdiction and authority over someone in your
21 courtroom that you can order them to file motions?

22 THE COURT: No, ma'am. I have jurisdiction and
23 authority over you and this case.

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: That's your assertion?

25 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. Then why haven't we had
2 documentation? Because I don't --

3 THE COURT: Because I don't send documentation in the
4 hundreds of cases I have.

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I get that.

6 THE COURT: I don't just send out --

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: How many do you have --

8 THE COURT: -- say, everybody --

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: How many do you have --

10 THE COURT: Can I finish? Because she's not going to
11 get down what you're saying --

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I apologize.

13 THE COURT: -- when you talk over me, like you're
14 doing now.

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I apologize. Go ahead.

16 THE COURT: Okay. I don't do that. I don't have
17 every defendant come in here and say, "Now, let me show you my
18 authority. Let me show you where I got appointed. Let me show
19 you this statute that says that -- let me take you back to the
20 constitution where this court system was set up. Let me show
21 you where the Congress then appointed the court."

22 I don't do that. Okay. It's a waste of time,
23 because the fact is, just because you say there is no United
24 States, just because you say it's foreclosed, just because you
25 say it's a corporation doesn't make it so.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 It would be as if you were to say that my robe was
2 red. Just because you say it doesn't make it so. And if you
3 were to ask for me to send you proof that it was black, I
4 wouldn't have to do that.

5 It's simply legal nonsense, and you've just made it
6 up out of whole cloth.

7 And so if you can show me that I don't have
8 authority, I will be glad to look at that, but until then, no.

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: So are you shifting -- just for
10 clarification, are you saying that you have it and that you've
11 shifted it to me when I'm the one --

12 THE COURT: I'm saying I showed you where my
13 authority came from. It comes from the law. It comes from the
14 Constitution of the United States. It comes from the
15 Congressional acts and the law of the United States. And your
16 response was, "Those don't exist."

17 So we're very simple. I say my law emanates -- my
18 jurisdiction and authority emanates from the law, and you say
19 the law doesn't exist. And you say that based on a filing in
20 which you claim that the law supports you. So that's where
21 we're going to have a problem.

22 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You can say it all day long. But
23 as far as I -- if it is that way, then I would be happy to
24 receive that in a sworn declaration, saying -- verifying and
25 validating your lawful authority that -- your position that you

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 believe you have. I have not received anything.

2 Once I make a declaration, that was just a
3 presumption at best, at most, that you had authority when I was
4 first brought in, and mind you, I didn't come in willingly,
5 knowingly, and intentionally. I was drug in with shackles.

6 THE COURT: No, ma'am. But, see, that's where you're
7 wrong. You just make up legal stuff. There's no presumption.

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I agree with you. There is no
9 presumption.

10 THE COURT: There's a reality.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I just declare that there is no
12 jurisdiction. That was done on the 24th. At that point, the
13 burden shifts to one who declares that -- or that presumes or
14 proffers that they do have jurisdiction. I haven't received
15 any of that.

16 THE COURT: Yes, you have in their response. It
17 says --

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: The response was duly rejected for
19 cause, because --

20 THE COURT: You just wrote on it, "duly rejected for
21 cause." That doesn't mean it's rejected. You can reject it.
22 And you did. And that's fine. You can throw it in the trash.
23 You can put it in a paper shredder. You can do whatever you
24 want with it.

25 I, on the other hand, and this court, accepted it,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 have read it, and pretty much agree with it. Because it sets
2 out our authority for the courts. It sets it out. It sets out
3 the jurisdiction. You just, quote, duly rejected it. She set
4 it out. So you asked me -- you asked me to give you stuff, and
5 what you will do is duly reject it.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I don't know --

7 THE COURT: Which means nothing.

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I don't know what you're going to
9 hand me.

10 THE COURT: It's legal mumbo jumbo.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: It is not.

12 THE COURT: It doesn't exist in the law, and you know
13 that because you're a lawyer, that there is no way a criminal
14 defendant charged with a criminal defense in this court or any
15 other courts can walk in and write "duly rejected" and "void"
16 on that indictment and walk away from their crime. But --

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Actually, I do a hundred percent
18 know that's how it actually functions, as far as the -- the
19 things that you sent up to the Federal Reserve, the clerks --

20 THE COURT: I send nothing to Federal Reserve.

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: You don't, but the court clerk
22 does --

23 THE COURT: No, she doesn't.

24 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- the clerk of the court. The
25 clerk of the court sends it out, and JP Morgan actually

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 monetizes it. What I'm telling you is, you can present me
2 anything you want all day long.

3 THE COURT: But I'm saying --

4 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I will review it. I will either
5 accept it or reject it. That's how it actually works. I do
6 not have proof of her identity. That's why it was rejected
7 without dishonor.

8 She can re-present it if she just gives me -- I don't
9 have anything with her authorization from Nancy Stallard.
10 Nancy Stallard supposedly hasn't even been reconfirmed by the
11 Senate yet. I mean, there are a lot of issues here.

12 If you want to present me that documentation, but
13 there was nothing -- you brought me in. I told you I do not
14 consent to you having authority over me. I've given you
15 documentation, even before I arrived, of my sole authority, my
16 ownership, and my status, my legal status.

17 And everyone went in, if there was no presumption,
18 great, then my lack of jurisdiction is completely with honor,
19 and it is completely the only thing that exists here right now.

20 I do not have anything from you other than some
21 words. So if you want to put those words down on a piece of
22 paper and sign it with your responsibility or in your position,
23 whatever you want to do, just -- I will take that.

24 Hers was rejected because she -- Ann-Marie Svolto,
25 because she sent me something, it didn't have her

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 identification. It didn't have her authorization from Nancy
2 Stallard. It didn't have Nancy Staller's authorization from
3 whoever appointed her. And like I said, even supposedly Senate
4 hasn't even reconfirmed her yet.

5 THE COURT: Here's where we have the biggest problem,
6 two things. Number one, so many of the facts you alleged are
7 utter falsehoods. They're completely not true. That's number
8 one.

9 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Which ones, I'm sorry?

10 THE COURT: When you said I reported to the Federal
11 Bank.

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I didn't say you. All the
13 documents from the clerk of court --

14 THE COURT: Yeah.

15 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- where do you think that goes?

16 THE COURT: They don't go to any bank.

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Who do they go to?

18 THE COURT: I know where they go.

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. They will go to whoever you
20 send them to. And then from there, it's sent to another, and
21 then from there, it's sent to another. But I can tell you they
22 end up at the Federal Reserve. And JP Morgan Bank is actually
23 the ones who usually -- we call them prison bonds is the street
24 term, but they are securities.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Number two, I think I'm now

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 getting where our real disconnect is. You want all of us to
2 submit all this authorization, validation, everything, because
3 you think that you have to consent to being prosecuted. And
4 unless we show you our authority, validation, justification,
5 identification, you aren't in a position to consent.

6 The point is, you don't get to consent.

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Under what authority?

8 THE COURT: Most criminal defendants are in here
9 against their consent. They don't want to be prosecuted. And
10 they don't want to go to prison.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Well, that's where the disconnect
12 has been in the legal system --

13 THE COURT: Right.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- is that there is no consent.
15 And people when they do say that they cancel any consent that's
16 manufactured --

17 THE COURT: That's my point that your argument --

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: We're sending people to jail that
19 haven't consented.

20 THE COURT: Can I finish? Your argument would mean
21 for everybody out there, I can go rob a bank, I can go assault
22 anybody, I can break in Ms. Jarraf's house, take all your
23 belongings, and then simply say to the police, "You don't have
24 any authority, and you can't take me to court, because I don't
25 consent. And, Ms. Prosecutor, you can't prosecute me. And,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 Mr. Judge, you can't sentence me, because I don't consent. I'm
2 going to go back out and do more of it, because I don't
3 consent. And if you file anything, I will write 'duly
4 rejected,' and then you have to let me go."

5 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. That is not what I'm saying.

6 THE COURT: That is exactly what you're saying.

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. That is not what I'm saying.
8 It's similar to Mr. Parker Still, I understand where the call
9 came down to have me arrested. I understand where that came
10 from. I know where that came from. Okay. I haven't committed
11 any crimes. If anything, I have a 20-year history of stopping
12 crimes from being committed. However, I understand why he was
13 asked to do this. I understand completely. I have not
14 committed any crimes. And as far as --

15 THE COURT: This has nothing to do with what I said.

16 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Yes, it does.

17 THE COURT: No.

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Because there's an abuse. You
19 have -- same thing in the 1920s, you have the same thing going
20 on where you have unconscionable illegal acts being committed
21 by those who have been charged with the duty to uphold laws.

22 And these laws were actually regulations of commerce.
23 You have things that were regulated, put into regulations, and
24 people are actually in jails, whether you want to admit it or
25 not or whether you know it or not, by their consent, but it is

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 a manufactured consent.

2 I am saying everyone, we do our jobs correctly, we do
3 our jobs right. The only thing that was closed down was the
4 fraud of corporations operating under the guise of government.

5 I have been in this country, I have worked not just
6 for this country, but for every single human being on this
7 planet only for the last 20 years. That has been what I
8 breathed and lived so that there is no more fraud being
9 committed and there is no more injustice.

10 I'm saying let's do our jobs properly. Let's do the
11 ones we think we're doing. So that is what is happening right
12 now is the disclosure, the actual public awareness that the
13 corporation that was operating under the guise of government
14 wasn't -- wasn't the United States that you thought you were
15 working for. That's all that was --

16 THE COURT: I understand. But your whole praecipe
17 and all your filings say you and your case should be dismissed,
18 not because you're innocent, not because you didn't do anything
19 wrong, but because nobody has any authority to prosecute you.

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No. It's because you're sitting
21 on a corporate bench that actually --

22 THE COURT: Because I'm sitting on a corporate bench,
23 I have no authority to prosecute you or to -- I mean, to sit in
24 judgment of you.

25 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: This is where we had the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 disconnect that is being resolved right now because of this
2 case, which is why I'm committed to having an amicable
3 disposition of this case so that we can --

4 THE COURT: I mean, that's your point, though.
5 Right? That's your point.

6 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: My point is, that your authority,
7 your jurisdiction, they don't exist under the -- under laws and
8 applications that you didn't even know existed.

9 THE COURT: Okay.

10 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm saying that I gave you the
11 authority to be able to issue that order, and I'm going to
12 follow that until we have an amicable disposition in this case.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I am not here to harm anyone.
15 I've never harmed anyone, so --

16 THE COURT: Well, the disconnect is you want an
17 amicable disposition. I'm pretty sure you would not agree to
18 being found guilty and being either fined or sentenced to time.

19 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I don't consent to doing any of
20 that, and it never was designed -- this case was not designed,
21 and those involved made sure it would not go there -- it would
22 not go to that disposition.

23 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Svolto, what's the
24 government's response?

25 MS. SVOLTO: We'll rely primarily on our written

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 response. But I'm not sure there's anything I can tell Your
2 Honor or Ms. Tucci-Jarraf or Mr. Beane that will change
3 anyone's minds here.

4 This Court has to find that it has personal
5 jurisdiction over the defendants and subject matter
6 jurisdiction over the defendants. It unquestionably has both.

7 The United States Code, 18 U.S.C. Section 3231 that
8 Your Honor referenced earlier, gives this Court subject matter
9 jurisdiction over matters involving crimes against the United
10 States.

11 It is not in dispute that the defendants were charged
12 by a grand jury for crimes against the United States. So the
13 Court, therefore, under the valid United States Code has
14 subject matter jurisdiction over the criminal case. And the
15 Court has personal jurisdiction over each of the defendants,
16 because they have been charged with a criminal offense.

17 The fact that they were brought here forcibly and
18 without consent does not deprive the Court of personal
19 jurisdiction. As Your Honor has noted, criminal defendants do
20 not have to agree to be prosecuted. And this Court does not
21 have to find that they consent to being prosecuted in order to
22 have personal jurisdiction over the defendants.

23 So the Court certainly has personal jurisdiction over
24 Mr. Beane and Ms. Tucci-Jarraf.

25 With respect to the UCC filings, those have no legal

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 consequence. It appears that the -- you know, the defendants
2 are arguing that there was some sort of default judgment issued
3 against the United States that put the United States in
4 foreclosure or that put the United States in some sort of
5 default. And then they filed the UCC statement saying that.

6 The UCC statement itself has no legal relevance over
7 the jurisdiction of this case. It doesn't appear to be based
8 on an actual judgment anywhere. The fact that it states a
9 declaration of judgment doesn't make it a declaration of
10 judgment. It doesn't mean there was a default judgment.

11 Whether notice of the foreclosure was ever sent to
12 the United States Secretary of State or anyone else does not
13 make the UCC filing statement a valid, enforceable judgment in
14 any way.

15 And because the UCC statement is merely -- a typical
16 UCC filing statement is merely used to perfect a security lien.
17 The security interest and the lien would have to be based on a
18 valid judgment. And no valid judgment against the United
19 States exists here. So the UCC filing statements are of no
20 consequence to the finding of jurisdiction.

21 With respect to the Court and the United States
22 having to prove their authority, the Court is under no
23 obligation to do so, neither is the United States.

24 If the Court has any obligation with respect to the
25 defendants' argument in that matter, it's to tell them that

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 they're wrong. So there is no obligation to prove that Your
2 Honor is an authorized judge.

3 The jurisdiction lies in the statutes we've
4 presented, and that is all that is of consequence here. The
5 Sixth Circuit, the Seventh Circuit have all addressed this.

6 These types of arguments where the court does not
7 have jurisdiction over someone who's essentially claiming to be
8 a sovereign citizen are meritless, and that there is no need to
9 consent to jurisdiction, but that the Court must find personal
10 subject matter jurisdiction.

11 Both of those exist here, and that's the position of
12 the United States. So if there are no questions, I'll --

13 THE COURT: So are you familiar with the United
14 States vs. Pryor?

15 MS. SVOLTO: Yes.

16 THE COURT: And did the Sixth Circuit hold that
17 courts, much like this one, including this one, have both
18 subject matter and in persona jurisdiction in criminal
19 prosecutions?

20 MS. SVOLTO: Yes.

21 THE COURT: Did the Supreme Court deny cert in that?

22 MS. SVOLTO: Yes. That was -- that cert was denied
23 last year. The case came out in 2015 or 2016.

24 THE COURT: And is it your understanding that it's my
25 duty to follow the law of the Sixth Circuit?

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 MS. SVOLTO: Yes, it is.

2 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

3 MS. SVOLTO: Thank you.

4 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Jarraf, response to that?

5 Are you familiar with the Pryor case, U.S. v. Pryor?

6 I can give you the cite if you'd like it.

7 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: No, I'm familiar with all that.

8 THE COURT: Do you agree that it's part of my
9 obligation to follow the rulings of the superior, the court
10 above me, the court of appeals, the Sixth Circuit?

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I am familiar with every case that
12 Anne-Marie Svolto cited.

13 THE COURT: I didn't ask you that. I asked you about
14 matters such as stare decisis, precedent, things like that,
15 that I'm supposed to follow the law when they say what the law
16 is. Right?

17 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I'm familiar with that.

18 THE COURT: I mean, do you agree I'm supposed to do
19 that or not?

20 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Please just make your
21 declarations, and then I'll respond to make my response that
22 you had asked me for.

23 So as far as you kind of -- you asked me do I have a
24 response? I went to start, and then you started in about
25 Pryor.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 THE COURT: Well, I meant your response to that last
2 part, to the Pryor case. Do you have a response to that?

3 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I have a response to she talked
4 about sovereign citizen, the constitution, as well, was brought
5 in, because she declared that she's relying on her written
6 statements. Correct?

7 THE COURT: Yes, but --

8 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: So as far as sovereign citizen, I
9 cancel that. That's an oxymoron to begin with. I'm not a
10 citizen --

11 THE COURT: You're not a citizen?

12 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- or a sovereign. Sovereign
13 requires someone underneath you to rule -- so that you can rule
14 them. I'm not a sovereign -- I'm not a sovereign citizen. I
15 don't even know what that means. I'm not a constitutionalist,
16 or she even limited to me being a -- am I -- myself and
17 Mr. Randall Beane as being human -- what is it, a bled and --
18 let me refer to that.

19 She has just before you now declared that she's
20 relying on her filings, her response to supposedly the motion.

21 Number one, I correct the fact that I have not made a
22 motion. I've made a praecipe, based on the due clause.

23 However, as far as her reference right now to a
24 sovereign citizen, there's no way I can be a sovereign citizen.
25 It's an oxymoron just in the actual phrase, sovereign citizen.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 I don't subscribe to any of that.

2 I don't subscribe to constitutionalism, because of
3 the basis under the fact that the constitution was a contract.
4 I was not a party to or signatory to it. However, through
5 fraud and everything else that has been committed, everyone had
6 been brought in as an employee, which is what the Social
7 Security cards in part are, just in part.

8 I'm not -- no longer that as well. I'm not an
9 employee of any corporation offered under the guise of
10 government. I'm not a citizen of any corporation operating
11 under the guise of government.

12 Again, I do reject -- I duly reject Anne-Marie
13 Svolto's presentment by relying on what she's filed. I orally
14 duly cancel or reject it without dishonor for the same reasons
15 as before, which is, she has not provided identification, due
16 verification, validation of identification, authority or
17 authorization to present on behalf of the United States.

18 And in response to everyone here, the record is still
19 void of anyone's due verification and validation of
20 identification, authority, authorization to present on behalf
21 of, in this case, Anne-Marie Svolto and Cynthia Davidson, to be
22 able to present for the United States, as far as C. Clifford
23 Shirley, Jr. presenting on behalf of, not sure, Eastern
24 District of Tennessee, department -- excuse me, United States,
25 but that is the title you have, United States Eastern District

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 of Tennessee magistrate judge.

2 So all of the record is void of any of that
3 authorization, authority, and identification. I re-declare
4 orally and via praecipe to enter dismissal with prejudice and
5 declaration of due cause. That was document, I believe, 43,
6 and then also Document 54, the praecipe, which was filed
7 yesterday, 10/17/17. As if restated and incorporated by
8 reference as --

9 THE REPORTER: As if what?

10 THE COURT: Set forth in full.

11 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Sorry. The microphone, do I need
12 to pull it closer?

13 THE COURT: Just talk slower.

14 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: Okay. So I accept every statement
15 that has been issued by C. Clifford Shirley, Jr., Anne-Marie
16 Svolto, as well as Cynthia Davidson.

17 THE COURT: What do you mean you accept them?

18 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: I accept all the statements you've
19 made here today.

20 THE COURT: You accept that?

21 MS. TUCCI-JARRAF: -- as proof of collusion,
22 ignorance, and corruption. I at this point would say not
23 corruption, because I believe that there is an ignorance, but
24 not by your design, but by the design of those who actually
25 will be charged -- or excuse me, the accounts ledgered. But it

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 is not due to your own willing and knowing actions of what
2 actually is the law. That is the problem here.

3 So at this point, all of your statements are accepted
4 as proof of, number one, failure to not provide and intent not
5 to provide the sworn verifications and validations that you
6 have -- that are your burden to meet, as well as statements,
7 proof of your ignorance and incompetency to move forward in
8 this particular case. Thank you.

9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

10 Now, Mr. Beane.

11 MR. BEANE: Yes. I'd like to accept and adopt what
12 Ms. Tucci-Jarraf has just added.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 MR. BEANE: Also add to -- for myself, the sovereign
15 citizen status that has been pinned on me, I've never admitted
16 to being a sovereign citizen. I do not accept that statement.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 MR. BEANE: It is my understanding a sovereign
19 citizen is considered a terrorist of the United States. And I
20 am not a terrorist. I do not accept being called a sovereign
21 citizen in this courtroom.

22 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else that
23 you would like to say about any of your other filings?

24 MR. BEANE: Not at this point, no.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Anything else on behalf of the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

1 government?

2 MS. SVOLTO: No. Thank you, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: All right. The Court will -- I'm going
4 to take all this under advisement. Ordinarily, I would say I
5 would rule on the filings. Little difference here since
6 Ms. Jarraf asked me not to do that, because it's specifically
7 not a motion, but rather an order to me to do something.

8 So I'll just have to take that under advisement, give
9 it my due consideration. And I will issue a ruling in any
10 event, and we'll decide what to do going forward in this
11 matter.

12 All right. There being nothing further, court stands
13 in recess till the trial resumes this afternoon.

14 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. This honorable
15 court stands in recess.

16 (Proceedings adjourned at 11:24 a.m.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF TENNESSEE

COUNTY OF KNOX

I, Rebekah M. Lockwood, RPR, CRR, do hereby certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically report the foregoing proceedings; and that the foregoing pages constitute a true and complete computer-aided transcription of my original stenographic notes to the best of my knowledge, skill, and ability.

I further certify that I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any of the parties, nor am I a relative or employee of any of the parties' attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I financially interested in the action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand at Knoxville, Knox County, Tennessee this 2nd day of November, 2017.



REBEKAH M. LOCKWOOD, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
Eastern District of Tennessee